

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner objected to the definition of "X" in Claim 1. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more clearly define "X" as being a sulfonate.

The 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoechst (GB 1391918). The Examiner stated that Hoechst discloses a pharmaceutical formulation including compounds that are within the scope of those claimed. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to define "X" as being a sulfonate. Hoechst does not teach or suggest a pharmaceutical formulation including a compound recited in Claim 1 wherein X is a sulfonate.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krummeich (Appl. Radiat. Isot. Vol. 46, No. 9, 1195, PTO-1449). The Examiner stated that Krummeich discloses a formulation that includes compounds which are within the scope of those claimed. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to define "X" as being a sulfonate. Krummeich does not teach or suggest a pharmaceutical formulation including a compound recited in Claim 1 wherein X is a sulfonate.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gavras (US 4,574,079). Applicants note that Claim 21 is not pending in the present application. The Examiner stated that Gavras discloses a formula that includes compounds that are within the scope of those claimed. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to define "X" as being a sulfonate. Gavras does

10/022,885, filed 12/18/01

not teach or suggest a pharmaceutical formulation including a compound recited in Claim 1 wherein X is a sulfonate.

For these reasons, Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Hoechst, Krummeich or Gavras. Since Claims 4-17 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, claims 4-17 are not anticipated either.

#### The 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1,2 and 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Hoechst or Krummeich or Gavras in view of Shochat (US Pat 5,961,955) and Snyder (US Pat 4,197,288).


As described above, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to define "X" as being a sulfonate. None of Hoechst, Krummeich or Gavras, either alone or in combination with Shochat and/or Snyder, teach or suggest a pharmaceutical formulation including a compound recited in Claim 1 wherein X is a sulfonate. For these reasons, Claim 1, as amended, is not obvious in view of Hoechst, Krummeich or Gavras, either alone or in combination with Shochat and/or Snyder. Since Claims 4-17 depend either directly or indirectly from amended Claim 1, Claims 4-17 are not obvious either.

10/022,885, filed 12/18/01

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notification thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Elisabeth T. Jozwiak  
Registration No. 41,101  
Phone: 989-636-2880

P. O. Box 1967  
Midland, MI 48641-1967